UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/680,286	10/06/2003	Marguerite A. Cervin	CL2180USNA 5853		
	7590 09/19/200 DE NEMOURS AND (EXAMINER			
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805			CHOWDHURY, IQBAL HOSSAIN		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1652		
			<u> </u>		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/19/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/680,286	CERVIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Iqbal H. Chowdhury, Ph.D.	1652	

	Iqbal H. Chowdhury, Ph.D.	1652	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally rej	TE below);	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.14. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.15. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co: lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.2 and 8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		Il be entered and an e	explanation of
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amendments to claims 1 and 8 i.e. "capable of bioconverting --- carbon source to 1,3-propanediol" by using E. coli strain, and "SEQ ID NO: 65", now have changed the scope of the claims 1 and 8 that raise new issues, which need new search and further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: All previous rejections are maintained in view of non-entry of the amendments.

Applicants arguments regarding rejoining of claim 6 and rejection of claim 8 under 112, 2nd paragraph is moot due to non-entry of the amendments of claims.

Previous rejection of claims 1-3 and 8 under 112 (1) Written description and enablement is maintaiened. The Examiner agrees with the argument about disruption of endogenous recited genes in E. coli strain but disagrees with the arguments regarding genetically upregulating of said endogenous genes in E. coli. Applicants argue that procedues of upregulation and downregulation of genes are routine experimentation for those of ordinary skill in the art. This is not found persuasive because the specification does not describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation or describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation or describe what is the specific information regulated by distinct methods, such that knowledge regarding one gene is not applicable to others and one would need specific information regarding the regulatory pathway of each gene in order to increase the expression from an endogenous gene. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to make the claimed invention, which would require undue experimentation. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

REBECCA E PROUTY
PRIMARY EXPANINER

GR.000 1600